COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XIV. No. 10.] LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1808. [PRICE 10D.

"Oh, that mine enemy had written a Book!"——JOB.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

DUKE OF YORK.——In the natural, though, perhaps, vain, hope, that what I now write may be read at a time when many circumstances, now notorious and familiar, will have been forgotten, I am induced to enter upon the subject before me with a formality of statement, which, were it not for such hope, would be absurd, or at least, would not appear quite necessary.——For some weeks past, I might say for some months, there has been a talk about sending the Duke of York, who is, and, for several years, has been, the Commander in Chief of the land forces of this country, to take the chief command of the troops sent, and about to be sent, by England, to the aid of the people of Spain and Portugal, in their present arduous struggle against the French. This rumour has excited great interest amongst all ranks of people, from the leading men in and about the metropolis, down to the very clowns in their Sunday mornings' chat at the church doors; and, upon this subject, though upon no other that can be mentioned, there appears to have been a perfect unanimity of feeling and of expression. The press has not been idle. It has, in all the ways that it is capable of operating, kept pace with the colloquial discussions; and, as party writers, who are opposed to each other, must have something, in each other, to find fault with, every writer appears to have made it his study to seek out, in his opponent, as an object of attack, a failure, in some respect or other, to do justice to the public sentiment upon this particular subject.——Such, with respect to the Duke of York, was the state of the public mind, when, about twelve days ago, an anonymous pamphlet of fifty-three pages, published by Mr. Symonds of Paternoster Row, London, made its appearance, under the title of "A PLAIN STATEMENT OF "THE CONDUCT OF THE MINISTRY AND "THE OPPOSITION, TOWARDS HIS ROYAL "HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF YORK;" which pamphlet it is my present intention to analyse and remark upon.——First, however, let me state what the pamphlet does *not* contain.——When I saw a thing written in the way of answer to those, who, in the base rant of the day, are called "the *libellers*" of the Duke of York, I naturally expected to find, in this answer, something or other respecting the military commands, with which he had before been invested; because the point, and the sole point at issue, was whether, or not, he ought now to have the command in Spain; and, no one could possibly fail to perceive, that that point must be decided, in all rational and impartial minds, by the experience of the past. What was my surprize, then, to find, that the pamphleteer, the avowed defender and eulogist of the Duke, said not a word of the Duke's commands upon the continent of Europe, and did not even glance at them from the beginning to the end of his work, though of the publications, of which it was his object to complain, there was not one, which had not, in some way or other, touched upon those commands! Before all other things, therefore, it appeared necessary to clear up these matters, or, at least, to say all that an advocate was, upon such an occasion, able to say. But, instead of this what have we? Why the following curious logic, which I may venture to say will long remain without an equal.—"From "his youth upwards, his royal highness has "passed through every stage of his military "career. *No one* has yet appeared so totally "wanting of all truth, *as to question his* "*royal highness's personal courage.* Let "it be granted then, that with this *acknow-* "*ledged* personal courage, added to the com- "mon sense, which, *we should hope,* no "one will deny him, his royal highness has, "at least, obtained the common knowledge "of his profession. Let us at least allow "him what is denied to no one, that he "cannot have passed through such a course "of study, and *under the best masters of* "*the age,* without having acquired what "is almost necessarily acquired by every "one in a similar course. Grant that his "royal highness is *not superior* to other ge- "nerals, *why* should he be inferior? It is "known to every one who approaches him, "that he is not wanting in *natural talents,* "in a *solid and just understanding,* "and in the art of observing, and *availing* "*himself of his observations.* Let us put it "therefore, to the candour of the public, "and of the gentlemen of the army, if, with "*such* an understanding and *such* expe-

" rience, *such* advantages of rank, and " with *such* good masters, it is not a " reasonable presumption, that his royal " highness has at least the common and " sufficient knowledge of his military profes- " sion? *Surely*, it is not *too much* to ask " this concession."——This is not, indeed, generally speaking, much to ask. The disputant who should refuse to grant it, even in this particular case, might be deemed cruel, perhaps. But, suppose *he should refuse*, and suppose his refusal should be grounded upon a denial of those premises, which this expert reasoner presumes all the world to admit? Upon this supposition, what becomes of the argument? It is not thus, that men argue to conviction. Conviction, by the means of argument, requires premises really admitted, or, which is the same thing in effect, facts which are generally acknowledged, and which acknowledgement is a necessary consequence of well-known deeds or events. If, indeed, this writer had appealed to the history of the actions, in which the Duke has been engaged, and shewed us that there were proofs of what he chose to take as his premises, the conclusion might naturally have followed; but, whatever may be the fact, however true it may possibly be, that the Duke " has, at least, the common and sufficient " knowledge of his military profession," this writer has stated nothing, nothing at all, in *proof* of the proposition; which, therefore, remains a subject open to discussion, but which I do not think it necessary to discuss, and shall only just observe, with respect to the " *best masters of the age*," either the writer must allude to such as are now under the Duke's own command, or to such as have been beaten, and driven from one end of Europe to the other, by that enemy, against whom we have now to contend. But, is it sufficient to ask us, " why the Duke should be *inferior* to other " generals?" Is it right to throw upon the public the burthen of proof, that our Commander in Chief, that the person on whose wisdom and skill and valour so much must depend, that the person who is entrusted with the defence of our country; is it right to throw upon us the burthen of proving, that this person is *inferior* to other generals? Is it upon ground like this, that the writer puts forward a claim to our confidence? One might have expected, that the avowed advocate of him, who is so highly empowered and entrusted, and who receives sums so very large from the public purse, would have made it a point, especially as his professed purpose was to remove " public prejudices," to endeavour, at least, to convince us, that the Duke, the person who is to have the chief command in defending our properties and our lives, is *superior*, in military merit, to other generals, or to such other generals, at least, as we have in our service. If the country be not in danger; if there be not a strong probability, that this land will be invaded by a powerful foreign foe, why all these preparations? Why all these forts and posts and barracks; why all these volunteers and local militia and foreign troops; why such immense expenses; why such sacrifices of every description? Well, then, such being the case, is it sufficient to ask us to prove, that he, who is entrusted with the direction of all this force, is *inferior* to other generals? Is this thought sufficient to satisfy us, especially when accompanied with a charge of *libel* against every one, who, for years past, has dared to move his pen upon the subject? Such a writer does, verily, complain, with a good grace, " that the spirit " of the times is not in favour of even that " measured obedience, that moderate res- " pect to government, which is necessary " to the very existence of a community"! What does he wish for? What degree and what marks of submission does he want? All that has been said; all that has offended him; all that has stirred his gall, and urged his stupid head and vindictive heart to the executing of this miserable pamphlet, has consisted of supplications, uttered in delicate hints and faultering accents, the effusions of the fears of a people, whom the love of life has not yet entirely forsaken.——Now we come to what the pamphlet *does* contain, and this is expressed in a very few words: it is a reproachful complaint against both the ministry and the opposition for having suffered the Duke of York to be " libelled," as this writer calls it, by the several editors of papers, and other writers, in this kingdom, and for having done nothing in defence of his character. The person preferring this complaint, says, that the present administration, for reasons best known to themselves, choose to detach an individual from their body, to put him, as it were, out of the covering protection of their society, and to give encouragement to a public persecution of him; that any one, not acquainted with public affairs, would be astonished to be told, that the most effective officer in the state, he who should at least be the most effective officer, is represented as one who is not to be trusted with the execution of what falls most immediately within his official duties, and when the ministers of the country

neither repel this accusation nor act upon it; do the ministers, asks he, believe it, or not? If they do, why not act upon it? If not, is there no Attorney General, or no Treasury papers? Is every possible fund of defence exhausted? He asks, whence it has happened, that, in all the friendships and enmities of parties, in all these contests of contrarieties, the Duke of York has never had even the usual advantage, being neglected by one party and passed over by another? He says, that a powerful party have been indisposed against the Duke, have withheld from him the natural and necessary protection due to his rank and station, have left him naked to the assaults of his low-minded libellers, left him without allies in his time of need; and, asks he, "in what manner "has CORIOLANUS so offended both the "Consuls and the Senate, that he is cast "out naked to meet his fate amongst the "factious Tribunes?" In the aptness of a comparison consists its merit. CAIUS MARCIUS, though of a patrician family, was urged, by his zealous valour, to serve as a common soldier, in the Roman army, at the siege of Cariola. The Romans having been repulsed, he rallied some of his comrades, fell upon the enemy, and, pursuing them in their retreat, rushed pell-mell along with them into the city, of which he thus made himself master. The resemblance between the two characters, thus far, will easily be traced; and we have only to continue it through their moral virtues. The Roman General allotted to the gallant youth the richest part of the booty; but, he would accept of nothing but the name of CORIOLANUS, one horse, and one prisoner, who had formerly been his host, and whom he instantly set at liberty. The writer of the pamphlet before us, says that the Duke of York is not fond of flattery, which, we may presume, was his sole reason for not digressing in this place to cite some such instances of gratitude, disinterestedness, and magnanimity, in the subject of his fifty-three pages of eulogium. ——Having stated the fact of this disinclination, in both parties, towards the Duke, the writer then proceeds to state the cause of it; for, it will be easily perceived, that it was quite necessary to his purpose to find out a *cause*, other than that which the public have been disposed to alledge. This cause, then, is, he says, that the Duke had all along adhered to a settled resolution, *never to belong to any party*. And here I shall, for a while, confine myself to a mere quotation from the pamphlet, the matter being of a very delicate nature, if any thing can be called delicate coming from such a silly brute as this writer evidently is. "Since the days "of William III. there have existed in "this kingdom two avowed parties; an "Opposition and a Ministry. As a defence "from the overwhelming predominance of "either, every succeeding monarch has "deemed it necessary to have a kind of *Do-*"*mestic Party*—a kind of Closet and Fa-"mily Council, whom he may occasionally "interpose between *even his ministry and* "*himself*. The origin of this party has "been imputed to his majesty's father, or "rather, to his mother whilst Dowager of "Wales; but the point of fact is, that it "existed in the reign of George I., and "seems to have had no other origin than in "its *manifest necessity*. It was not the "creature of any design, or previous ar-"rangement; but, as a matter of prudence, "and necessary defensive policy, grew in-"sensibly out of the very nature of things. "—Now the immediate and almost neces-"sary members of this Party, are certainly "the King's Family and Household. Let "it not, therefore, be objected to the Duke "of York, that he has followed the course "of things."——Leaving this pretty description of a government to be commented on by those who have been so long in the habit of eulogizing our "glorious Consti-"tution," I now proceed to quote what is said about the cause of the enmity which the Opposition are said to bear the Duke.——"It was represented to "his majesty, that according to the "principles upon which his ministry had "humbly offered their services, the public "expected of them, and they conceived "themselves obliged, to introduce a perfect "reform in all the branches of public ser-"vice—that the Army wanted this reform, "and that his majesty would be pleased to "consent, that a private Commission of "Inquiry should be appointed to sit daily at "the Horse Guards, and that the report of "this commission should be presented to "his majesty's most gracious consideration. "——To this, likewise, his majesty con-"sented, and his royal highness did not "oppose it. The List of the Commis-"sioners was made by the ministry, and "for the sake of appearances, the name of "his royal highness was not omitted. His "royal highness, however, did not deem it "decorous to sit on a Court of Inquiry into "his own conduct. The party, therefore, "and the Commission had their own Presi-"dent. It is not the purpose of the pre-"sent Notes to enter into any detail as to "the decency with which they executed "this inquisition. Suffice it to say, that

" after a party, and therefore a rigorous " inquiry, it was not deemed prudent either " to make or to present a report. Another " resolution was taken, and it was determined to attempt indirectly, and as it " were by intrigue, what could not be " hoped from other more direct means. It " must really be matter of astonishment " to all candid men, that individuals of an " honourable name, and hitherto reputed " to be of corresponding sentiments, " should descend to such an unworthy cunning. The characteristic of a great, and " a little mind, says Bacon, is, that the " former takes the strait road, whilst the " latter creeps warily but cowardly to its " object by a bye-path.——Two measures, " it is stated, were accordingly adopted by " the party. The one was to represent to " his royal highness, that the multiplicity " of business in the office of commander in " chief required that his royal highness " should have some assistance, and that " therefore the ministry had to propose to " his royal highness a division of his department; that the branches from which his " royal highness would be thus relieved, " might either be put in commission, assigned to certain boards, or supplied by " individuals;—that in the latter case the " ministry would consider it as belonging " to them to recommend, but that the nomination should be in his royal highness. " That it was not amongst their wishes to " diminish any thing of the patronage of " his royal highness, or to detract any thing " from the splendour of the commander in " chief. But that from regard to his royal " highness, and from a deep consideration " of the value of his royal highness's time " as commander in chief in the higher offices of his department, it was the anxious wish of the ministry to relieve his " royal highness from the subordinate details ——A negotiation was accordingly " commenced with his royal highness upon " these grounds; in the course of which " his royal highness learned what was intended by these " subordinate details, " " and minor branches." His royal highness, in a word, learned, that these subordinate details, and minor branches, " were such as to reduce his office to a mere " cypher, and leave him, as commander in " chief, in a situation about as active, as " necessary, and as important, as the master of the horse. His royal highness very " naturally felt himself offended at being " entrapped even into a negotiation in a " business so adverse to his personal interests and military character; and the negotiation was accordingly broken off with " abruptness and mutual disgust.——Is it a " reasonable subject of surprise, therefore, " that thus beset, thus assailed at once by " the open hostility of some, and the insidious friendship of others, his royal " highness deemed it necessary to *throw* " *himself upon the immediate protection of* " *his royal father?*——The proposed measure of the Grenville party was thus *defeated by the immediate interposition, not* " *to say the command of his majesty.* But " this ambitious party, though thus disappointed, were not defeated; they invented another rallying post, and the words " " military council, and military board of " " supervision," were distributed as the " watch word of the party. The idea was " quickly circulated through all the ministerial papers, and the cry of a party was " magnified into the popular voice. The " people, it was said, demanded a military " council, and the nation would be lost, " unless the *inexperience* of the commander " in chief was assisted by a board of military supervision. It was moreover insinuated in one or more of the papers of " the party, that his royal highness was " not averse to the appointment of such a " board. Every thing, in a word, was put " in motion to work upon the popular mind; " and to those who know of what inflammable materials the people of England " are made, it is needless to insist that so " many engines were not inefficacious.—— " Nothing could be more unpleasant than " the situation of his royal highness during " all this turmoil of intrigue and faction. " His open assailants were of a class with " whom his royal highness could not, consistent with his personal dignity, enter " into a contention. In what manner, for " example, could he oppose the attack of " newspapers, the assault of paragraphs, " and the storm of diurnal invective? Every " newspaper was in the hands of the " reigning party, or if one of them boasted " of its independence, it usually proved its " claim by a daring attack on his royal highness. This abuse was usually introduced " in terms expressive of the " candour and " " reluctance " of the writer. They were " unwilling (good creatures!) to wound " the feelings of any individual, and particularly of one in every respect so meritorious as his royal highness; but in common candour they were compelled to acknowledge, that the perilous situation of " affairs called for unusual vigour in the military department, and that his royal highness would be much relieved, by the ap-

" pointment of a military council. The " similarity of all these paragraphs, and " certain words which were common to all, " seemed to bespeak their common origin, " and the public hearing the same thing " said on all sides, and by all parties, *began* " to *conclude that there was something in it;* " and the press, in *pamphlets* and *reviews,* " echoed back the clamour of the *daily jour-* " *nals.*"——The author then goes on to speak of the complaints made by the Duke to the ministers, upon the subject of these attacks, but of complaints we shall notice bye and by. At present our attention is called to a paragraph of the pamphlet, which is extremely mysterious, but which, perhaps, the reader will make shift to comprehend. " In this man- " ner, in this urgency for a direct inquiry " on one side, and this refusal to grant it on " the other, passed away the whole period " of the late administration, until some time " about the conclusion, when it was deemed " necessary, from *party expediency,* and " from motives which require no explana- " tion, to make CERTAIN PROPOSALS " to his royal highness. To these proposals " his royal highness *may be presumed* to have " answered, that it was the settled maxim " of his life *to belong to no party,* but to " consider himself as the servant and subject " of the king;—that he moreover did not " agree in opinion with his majesty's mi- " nisters upon the points in agitation; but " did not deem it necessary to explain him- " self more fully. That with respect to any " OPPOSITION AGAINST HIM his royal " highness might have added, that he was at a " loss to understand *what could be intended* " *by it,* as his majesty's ministers, in all " his royal highness's demands for inquiry, " had repeatedly disavowed their knowledge " of any such personal hostility. Under all " circumstances his royal highness could, " we think, see no sufficient reason for de- " parting from the settled maxim of all his " former life,—to consider himself as a " member of the royal family, and the ser- " vant of his sovereign alone. That, least " of all, therefore, could his royal highness " have any will or opinion in contradiction " to that of his father.—Within a few days " after this latter negociation, the Grenville " and Fox party had ceased to be ministers, " and his majesty had summoned others to " his council.—It may be collected from " this statement, that neither in the com- " mencement, nor in the conclusion of the " Grenville administration, could this party " be considered as friendly to his royal high- " ness. This statement, moreover, may pos- " sibly account for one part at least of the gene- " ral hostility against his royal highness."—— ——After some personal remarks, in which Earl Grey is represented as arrogant, Earl Moira no wiser than he should be, and Mr. Windham as inconstant in his friendships, the pamphleteer proceeds to state, that the Opposition consider the Duke as having had a share in their dismissal; but he denies the fact, and says: " The late ministry were " dismissed solely because they personally " offended, and contradicted in a point of " conscience, his majesty. His majesty had " no council but his own mind. He had ta- " ken his resolution when he summoned the " attendance of the Duke of York. He " conceived himself as having been deceiv- " ed by earl Grey; he accordingly declin- " ed seeing that nobleman. The Duke of " York, it is understood, merely obeyed " the commands of his father, *when he* " *signified by letter his majesty's pleasure* " *that lord Howick should not come to Wind-* " *sor.*"——He then proceeds to state the cause of the hostility of the *present ministry* towards the Duke of York, which statement I shall give in his own words:—" With re- " spect to the Ministry, his royal highness " is about as favourably situated as with the " Opposition. The enmity of the one may " be as easily accounted for on the ordinary " passions of mankind, as the other. His " royal highness, however, we presume, " cannot complain that the existing admi- " nistration are not friendly to him. Friend- " ship is not a thing of right on one side or " of obligation on the other. He never, " we believe, sought the friendship of mi- " nisters, and therefore has no complaint " that he does not possess it. There is, " however, or at least there should be, a " middle term between friendship and en- " mity. Where, therefore, is the justi- " fying cause for the conduct of adminis- " tration?—When his majesty had resolved " to constitute a new administration, if pub- " lic report may be credited, *his royal high-* " *ness had it in command from the king to* " *inform the duke of Portland of his ma-* " *jesty's intentions* His royal highness, it " is said, executed his majesty's commands " in person. He is said to have repeated " only the words of the king, and distinct- " ly to have informed the duke of Portland, " that he was to consider his royal highness " in no other point of view than as the mes- " senger bearing certain words of his ma- " jesty; that he had no list, and no autho- " rity to designate any individual whatever. " In a conversation which followed, the " same reports add, that his royal high-

" ness distinctly gave his grace to under-
" stand, that he wished to have no concern
" whatever with any party, farther than to act
" sincerely and cordially with any men whom
" his majesty might call to his confidence.
" —When the Ministry was formed, if the
" Writer of these Notes be correctly inform-
" ed, it was intimated to his royal highness
" by the duke, that his recommendation, in
" a certain appointment, would be attend-
" ed to; upon which his royal highness is
" again said to have replied, that he had
" merely executed the wishes of the king;
" that he wished to be considered as forming
" no part of any administration whatever;
" that if any difficulty occurred as to a suit-
" able person for the appointment in ques-
" tion, his grace would do well to consult
" with lord Hawkesbury, who had the
" king's commands in detail.—Such, we
" will presume, was the share, and such
" the only share, which his royal highness
" had in the formation of the existing ad-
" ministration. It may be collected from
" these particulars, that on this, as on every
" other occasion, his royal highness never
" departed a moment from his settled reso-
" lution, never to become a component
" part of any ministry.—Some time after
" the formation of the cabinet, his royal
" highness, we have heard, had an appoint-
" ed conference with one of the members of
" administration, in the course of which *a*
" *subject of much interest to his royal high-*
" *ness was introduced.* To this his royal
" highness is reported to have replied, that
" it was in the power of any member of ei-
" ther house to bring it forward; that he
" wished not to influence either the one
" way or the other; *that the papers* should
" be ready when called for; that he certain-
" ly *did not wish the ministry to take any*
" *part against him*; that as the subject it-
" self would be brought forward as a *party*
" *question* if brought forward at all, the mi-
" nistry might perhaps, deem it *their duty*
" *to take some share in the debate.* Through
" all these transactions, his royal highness
" must have been at a loss to discover any
" thing which could reasonably indispose
" the ministry against him. The adminis-
" tration, indeed, had endeavoured in vain
" *to annex his royal highness, by a distinct*
" *pledge, to their own immediate party.*
" But his royal highness could have no sus-
" picion, that, by adhering to the uniform
" maxim of his life, he must necessarily
" give offence to any party whatever. His
" royal highness, moreover, never hesitated
" to avow, that he would always persevere
" in that line of acting which he should
" know to be conformable to the sentiments
" of his majesty. —It is from *this period*,
" however, thar must be dated the origin
" of the ministerial alienation. The ministry
" seem resolved to compel every one to take
" a party—even his majesty's sons must
" fall within the ranks.—His royal high-
" ness, we will presume to say, is perfectly
" unconscious of having given any personal
" offence *to Mr. Canning*, or any of the
" ministers; yet, if any judgment may be
" formed from the conduct of these gentle-
" men, they seem to have entertained no in-
" considerable personal animosity against
" his royal highness. Party-feeling seldom
" proceeds so far as the unwearied persecu-
" tion of individual enmity. There have, in-
" deed, been instances, in which the whole
" weight of a party has been brought to bear
" against an individual; but in these cases
" some reasonable cause might be assigned
" for such excess of bitterness. But in what
" has his royal highness so offended all,
" that he is not only deserted by all, but
" persecuted by all? Surely there must
" be some cause beyond what appears."
——Then follows an eulogium upon Lord *Castlereagh*, and upon Lords *Hawkesbury* and *Liverpool*, who are acknowledged to have yielded protection to the Duke against the workings of faction.——Here, then, we have stated *the causes*, which, according to this writer, placed the two parties in enmity to the Duke of York, which causes appear to me to be quite insufficient to produce such an effect. The Opposition, indeed, if they suppose, that the Duke contributed towards putting them out of their places, depriving them of so many good things, may well dislike him; but, then, unfortunately for the argument of this writer, he himself states, that the inventions of malice and slander against the Duke were exhausted by the Treasury writers, under the Whig ministry, long before there was any notion of their places being in danger; and, it appears, as we shall see in detail, by-and-by, that, if this writer is to be believed, the Duke made frequent and fruitless complaints to that ministry respecting the attacks made upon him in their journals. So that the pretended slander, malice, and libelling, all existed before there was any proposal of a party nature made to the Duke. And, as to the present ministry, how could they be seriously affected by his declining to become one of their party? They wanted no support, and, if they did, it surely was not the way to obtain it, to side with persons who slandered the Duke, when they had every reason to believe, possessed

such powerful influence in a quarter so important to be conciliated. There is no sense in this accusation against either of the parties. The *cause* of what is called *hostility* is quite inadequate to the producing of such an effect. And what is this hostility? *How* and *when* has it appeared? I have perceived no hostility, in either of the parties, against the Duke of York; and except upon one particular point, I have observed in the daily prints, no inclination to criticise either his general or particular conduct. On the contrary, I am greatly misinformed, if, upon the occasion of Col. Cochrane Johnstone's court-martial, that gentleman was able to get inserted, in any one of those papers, a very mild, and even a very humble representation of the hardships which he conceived himself to have experienced; nay, I state as a fact, that he was unable to get inserted, except in one or two papers, and there by the means of heavy payment, *even a bare statement of the fact of his honourable acquittal.* So that, it does not appear, that, in either party, there ever existed any settled disposition to annoy the Duke of York. This writer forgets all the *good*, which the "hireling edi "tors," as he calls them, have said of the Duke of York. He and his Duchess have been the almost constant theme of their praise. They could not walk up any street together, but the conjugal circumstance was noticed in detail, even to motions and glances. All his birth-day festivals, all his reviews, all his motions have been noticed, and at every notice there has appeared to be, a rivalship in the sycophancy of the different editors. Nay, I defy this writer to refer me, even at this day, to one single paragraph in any daily paper, containing a censure, or even a *free* remark, upon the conduct or the character of the Duke of York. What does this writer want, then? What does this half-ideot, for such he *must* be, want of the poor degraded press? Does he want it to expose itself to the contempt of even the lowest of the rabble? What does he want? I should like to have his answer to this question.——Now we come to notice the complaints, which this writer says, were made by the Duke to the Whig ministry, and what he says is very well worthy of being remembered.——"These incessant "attacks could not but very seriously affect "his royal highness, and after having "maintained a dignified reserve as long as "*human patience* could support it, he at "length found it necessary to demand an "inquiry into his conduct.—Nothing could "be so ridiculous as the affected astonish-"ment of the ministry upon this demand. "Who has presumed to attack the interest "or the reputation of your royal highness? "*There are laws in the country to which* "*your royal highness may appeal.* Why "should there be a formal inquiry where "there is no formal charge? Why should "the ignorance or malignity of the daily "papers be raised into the consequence and "dignity of having called forth an official "inquiry? If any thing has been said or writ-"ten against your royal highness, of which "all his majesty's ministers must solemnly "disavow even any knowledge, the "Attorney General should be ordered "forthwith to commence a prosecution; "and if your royal highness be unwilling "personally to give your instructions to "that officer of the crown, *they may be* "*given to the treasury, by your royal high-*"*ness's secretary.* But his majesty's mi-"nisters would think themselves deficient "in a due sense of what they owed to their "own dignity as his majesty's councillors, "if they adopted a popular rumour as "sufficient grounds for an official inquiry." ——Well, this was pretty well, I think. What *more* did this writer wish them to do? He will tell us directly, in speaking of what he says has been the conduct of the present ministry, upon a similar occasion. ——"It may be urged, indeed, in reply "to all that has been said above, that the "attacks complained of, have not been "made with the knowledge, and still less "with the consent or concurrence of his "majesty's ministers: that they are all of "them too honourable men to concur in "such a system of anonymous attack: "that such a system, moreover, could "answer no conceivable purpose: that the "ministry are too strong in public opinion "and confidence, to require the assistance "of such unworthy arts. In a word, that "such a persecution, and so indirectly put "into operation, can have no purpose, "and therefore that it is a reasonable in-"ference that it has no existence.——To "this it must be answered, that when his "royal highness made similar represen-"tations, under the late ministry, the "answer was uniformly, that his majesty's "ministers were totally ignorant of the "very existence of the facts alleged; that "the law was open to his royal highness, "and that the Attorney General might be "instructed to prosecute; that they had no "influence or authority over the free press; "and that they advised his royal highness "to hold all such libellous accusation in the "contempt which it merited.——It is no-"torious, however, notwithstanding all

" this disavowal, that the free press, as it " *is called*, and as it should be, is almost " *equally divided between the two leading* " *parties in the country, and that the mi-* " *nisters and the opposition have the same* " *influence*, NOT TO SAY AUTHORITY, " *over them as if they were* THE ACTU- " AL EDITORS. Has any instance ever " occurred, in *which a billet from Down-* " *ing-street has been refused admission*, and " if required, *an ample confirmatory com-* " *ment*, through all the Treasury papers? " And will any, either of the ministry or " the opposition, declare, upon their ho- " nour as gentlemen, that they have no " authority or weight with the public pa- " pers? Whence does it happen, that the " honour of parties is not the same with " that of individuals, and that a party will " assert conjunctively, what every indivi- " dual of that party knows to be false? " Why is there not the same point of ho- " nour with a party as with an individual? " ——The indecent language in the daily " papers, is certainly not from the mouth " of the ministers. It is impossible that " men of honourable stations should " descend to such terms, and so such ano- " nymous acrimony. We are persuaded " that his royal highness most fully acquits " his majesty's ministers of any immediate " participation in such libels. But *the* " *encouragement*, the *countenance*, the *im-* " *punity of these libellers*, is the efficient " cause of the whole. Would the Editors " of the Daily Papers thus write, *unless* " *they were persuaded that they were ad-* " *vocating a cause generally pleasing to* " *their patrons?* As to a legal remedy for " this torrent of libel and invective, though " a jury of his countrymen would visit the " libellers with merited punishment, his " royal highness, we believe, will not be " lightly persuaded to introduce a practice " which he has never approved. There " have been perhaps already too many go- " vernment prosecutions, and a precedent " may thus be constituted, which, much to " the injury of the free press, may be here- " after acted upon. *Add to this*, that there " may be innumerable allusions, inuen- " does, and even assertions, which may " have substance enough to wound, and " that most deeply, but are *not palpable* " *enough for the visitation of the law.* " The libellers of his royal highness have " been too long practised in their school, " to commit themselves to the hands of a " jury. Let any man of honest feelings " read some of the cold-blooded articles " which have lately appeared in many of " the daily papers, and then answer, if his " indignation be not moved by their savage " malignity—yet are these libels conceived " in terms *so studiously picked and culled*, " *as to elude the just vengeance of the law.* " ——How many subjects, moreover, are " there which, however grossly offensive " to all honourable feeling, cannot be pro- " duced to the publicity of a legal trial. " Let any man put it to his own mind—how " many slanderous reports are daily in " circulation to the ruin of the peace and " character of their unhappy object, but " for which the sufferer is yet unwilling to " make his appeals to the laws of his coun- " try. *There is a necessary and indiscrimina-* " *ting publicity in law, from which a mind* " *of any delicacy cannot but avert.* His " royal highness has indeed suffered much, " but he will suffer still more, we should " think, before he can persuade him- " self to call on the *laws of his country.*"

——So, here we have an expression of this writer's wishes. He seems to allow, that nothing has been said of the Duke that even our libel law can lay its fangs upon, or, at least, with a fair chance of success; and, therefore, as the newspapers are, as he says, as completely at the command of the two parties, as if the leaders of those parties were the actual editors; and, as, with regard to the Treasury papers, " a billet from " Downing Street is never refused admit- " tance, accompanied, if required, by an " ample confirmatory comment," he would have had orders issued from Downing Street, to those papers, to insert certain billets, and to refuse others, relating to the Duke of York.——This writer must be an enemy of the Duke, under the mask of friendship; for, is it possible to form an idea of any thing more low, more mean, more shabby, more scurvy, more dirty, more base, than going to a ministry, and asking them to obtain the publication or the suppression of paragraphs, respecting him, in prints, which he must regard as being edited by the most venal of mankind? As if he had said to himself: no; the *law* will not do; the law cannot find any hold in the publications against me, and besides I do not like the *publicity* of law; I will, therefore, have recourse to corruption; I will, by the means of influence purchased with the public money, get a good word from those whom I despise. This is what this writer imputes to the Duke of York, and this he does under the mask of friendly compassion. This he does under the pretence of *defending* the royal chieftain against the attacks of his calumniators. I do not believe, that any act more base

was ever before imputed to any human being. If such be the friends of the Duke, well may he, with the poet, call for a defence against them; and, if the contents of a paragraph, in the Morning Post of the other day, be correct, he means to try the force of the law upon this libeller, at least, who, though he complains of anonymous slander in others, takes special care all the while, to keep his own name out of sight. What! go sneaking to the ministry to beg of them to speak a good word for him to the editors of the newspapers! Foh! it is so rank, it so stinks of meanness, that one's bowels are disordered at the thought, especially when imputed to a modern "CORIOLANUS." I am not for appeals to the law, respecting matters of this sort; but, something should certainly be done by the *real* friends of the Duke of York, to convince the world, that this part at least, of the pamphleteer's statements is false. I, for my part, shall anxiously wait for the contradiction, and shall hasten to give it to the world. What! (I cannot get it out of my mind) go to the ministry to supplicate their interference with the public papers! It is such an abominable story; such atrocious slander, that, surely it will be speedily contradicted. Why, if this statement be not proved to be untrue, who will ever again pay attention to any thing which those papers may say in favour of the royal soldier? Will not the public have reason to suppose, that the parties have, at last, been prevailed upon to issue their orders to the newspapers? It must be contradicted and it will, and I beseech my readers to watch, with me, for the appearance of the contradiction. ——This supreme ass of a writer, after having accused the editors of ignorance, malice, and so forth, and candidly acquitted the ministers of any direct share in the "libels," as he calls all the publications not flattering to the Duke of York, tells his readers, that many of those editors are "even well-"wishers to his royal highness, and few, "or none, of them have any personal en-"mity against him But," adds he, "his "royal highness has the misfortune to have "been the topic of the day; they are com-"pelled, therefore, to say something of "him, and they consider it as their duty *to* "*render that something as palatable as pos-*"*sible to their patrons.*" Here, then, the ministers, or, at least, the leaders of the parties are the *sole cause* of this hostility of the press against the Duke of York. But, this same writer has confessed, that Lords Hawkesbury and Liverpool had taken the Duke under their protection; he pronounces a high eulogium upon Lords Castlereagh and Eden, and boasts that the Duke has the friendship of the Duke of Portland. So here are one of the Secretaries of State, the Secretary of State for the war department, the Lord Chancellor, and the First Lord of the Treasury, and yet the Duke has *no friends*. He is "neglected by one party "and passed over by another." How happens it that these persons have nothing to do with *the press*? Did the Duke apply to them in vain? Why could they not have intefered, if any one could, to alter the tone of the press? This man contradicts himself. He does not know what to say. It is evident that he knows he is stating falsehoods. But, he must be half an ideot at least, or he never would have put pen to paper.——The challenge which he throws out to the editors is curious enough. "Let "them," says he, "produce *a distinct* "*charge*, and they shall have a distinct "answer; but, whilst they only beat about "the bush, in what manner is their desul-"tory malice to be brought within the pale "of an argumentative defence?" Within the pale of the *law* you mean, cunning and spiteful ideot as you evidently are. That is the pale wherein you want to see them. Will you, malicious and vindictive coward, insure them from *that* pale? This is what you should do before you challenge them to a "distinct charge." How many miscreants have we seen challenging the press in this way, and, the moment, they could get a hold, appealing, not to the force of reason, not to the test of truth, but to the fangs of the law, and that, too, by a form of process which prohibits the accused from urging, in his defence, the truth of his statements.——The editors, poor fellows! How base we are, are we not? What vile scoundrels we are, for not speaking out plain upon all occasions!——It is stated by this writer, towards the conclusion, and that too in a very peremptory tone, that the Ministry and the Opposition *must disavow* the attacks of the press upon the Duke of York. We shall see, now, whether this disavowal will be made. The pamphlet has certainly stated some very ugly things about the conduct of the *parties*. He has represented them as contending for the favour and the patronage of the Duke, and, being unable to gain him to themselves, have, out of revenge, persecuted him. He has stated pretty plainly, that Mr. Canning paid his court to the Duke; that that gentleman voluntarily made professions of kindness towards the Duke; and that Lord Moira and Mr. Windham did the same. It would be a shame to suppose that a wretch like this has

spoken from *authority*; but, he may have heard some rumour upon the subject. We shall see, when parliament meets, whether the *disavowal* will be made; and it will be well worth while for us to keep a good look-out for it.——Upon the subject of a contest in the present cabinet, this writer has the following passage: "With such opinions, so "freely avowed, and so notoriously acted "upon, whence can originate the absurd "suspicion said to be so current amongst "his majesty's ministers, that his royal "highness had any share in the *friendly* "*emulation* of the *two members* of the cabi- "net, whose inconsiderable differences, "much to his royal highness's satisfaction, "have been of late so happily composed. "his royal highness, we believe, was not "even asked to take any part in the contest, "and least of all, to take that unfair part, "which is inferred in the language of the "vague rumour. The *noble person* in ques- "tion would scorn to gain his purpose, if "purpose he had, by such arts—his com- "manding abilities—his habits, and know- "ledge of business, distinguish him emi- "nently. If there be any one who would "most passionately scorn the indirect aid of "the alleged intrigue, and who cer- "tainly stands in no need of it, it is the per- "son in question. *His Majesty knows the* "*worth of such a servant, and will not has-* "*tily either deprive himself of it, or by* "*withholding any merited grace, diminish* "*the zeal of his service.* Upon this subject, "therefore, we will most decidedly state, "that his royal highness had no concern "whatever, and that he knew not that the "emulation existed, except by general re- "port." The hint of *preference* is here pretty broad; and the rebuked rival will, doubtless, take care what he is about, if the facts alluded to be true. We see through all this, that it is clearly the opinion of this writer, that the Duke of York is, in fact, the master of the destinies of all the men whom the king employs, under the name of ministers; and that, if they displease him, they fail not, sooner or later, to meet with punishment.——But, in the meanwhile, the press, tame and humble as it is, adulatory as are its columns when the subject is any one of the royal family, is, in this writer's opinion, too bold. It is not yet humbled enough. It is not yet sufficiently corrupt; or at least, it is not yet enough under the controul, as this writer thinks, of the Duke of York. The complaint against the minister, is, however, very unjust in one point of view; for, if the Duke will be of *no party*; if he will be *a member of no ministry*, what claim has he to the protecting influence of any party or ministry? If he is as this writer says he is, of the "*domestic* "*party, the closet council,*" why, it is to the closet-council, of course, that he ought to look for a protecting influence, and not to the parties, against each of whom, by turns, this closet-council is to be opposed. Nothing can be more reasonable and fair than this. ——But, it is very strange, it is wonderful, that the Duke of York should stand in need of any protecting influence with the press. What protection should he want? If the press say of him what is *not true*, why are its sayings *not answered?* For this writer does not pretend, that any thing in favour of the Duke, has ever, in any quarter, been refused admission; and, besides, if the sayings are false, the falsehood will appear of itself, in a very short time; when the promulgators of it will sink into merited contempt. This base writer sets out, with laying it down as a maxim, "that no characters are so obnox- "ious to *unjust* reproach as those of *the* "*great*; and that the pedestal upon which "public characters are raised into more "conspicuous view, renders them, at the "same time, more assailable objects of envy "and malignity." If to publish *truth* were not criminal in law, this maxim might hold good; but, I appeal to the reader, whether it holds good amongst us, at this time, and whether he does not see daily proofs of the fact, that *the great* do, without any one's venturing to comment upon their conduct, that which would render common men subjects of loud and general execration. Oh, how many instances are now at the point of my pen! How base, how cowardly, and yet how insolent is it in any one to accuse the poor writers in England of *a propensity to assail the great!*——Amongst all the anecdotes, in which this writer has thought proper to deal, he does not seem to have paid much attention to that which related to the subject the most generally interesting to the public; namely, the supposed disputes in the cabinet respecting the Duke of York's going to Spain, which he slightly touches upon, at the end of his pamphlet, thus: "The point of fact is, perhaps, that such "appointment was *never solicited* on the "one part, or offered, except *formally*, on "the other. If the *nature of the service* "had been such as *to require* the employ- "ment of the Commander in Chief, the "ministry would, doubtless, have intimated "it to his royal highness." Aye, aye, I dare say they would; I dare say they would. It is all very well. The ministers did not, then, I suppose, think that the *nature of the service*

was such as to *require the employment of the royal chief*, in which opinion they will, I believe, be joined by most men of sense. It appears to be quite an easy job to beat the French in Spain. CORIOLANUS should be reserved for desperate enterprizes and a time of peril. ——But, why did this at once soft-brained and malignant writer return, just as he was coming to a close, to the subject of the Duke's military character? Why could he not let that sleep? "His royal "highness," says he, "would doubtless "deem it an indirect injustice to himself, "to enter into *any vindication* of his *pro-* "*fessional capacity*. Nor will the friends "of his royal highness *so dignify the tribe* "*of libellers, as to join issue with them* "*upon a point of this kind.* His military "character will neither depend upon their "conviction, nor be injured by their de-"cision."——Indeed? Why, then, did you, at the outset of your miserable pamphlet, spend so much time upon this vindication? You there, in your way, endeavoured to convince us, by reasoning, that the Duke of York was a competent general; and now you tell us, that to endeavour to produce such conviction would be an injustice to the Duke. Such are the inconsistencies, into which men fall, when they write without principle.——In conclusion, this wretched writer tells us to appeal to the army for the character of the Duke. The army! The army! What! to the whiskered or the shaved part of the army? To the men with long tails or the men with no tails? To the men in muffs and tippets or to those in high-crowned caps? To the army! Are you not ashamed, insolent as you are, to bid us make such an appeal. No: we are bound by no rule of this sort. We are not to be told to judge of any commander from what those *under his command* will say of him; but, from his deeds, wherein we know him full as well as they can. Oh, caitiff, you deserve to be skinned for what you have said upon this part of your subject. To tell us, that the Duke's "*best* "*reward* is the love of the army!" Why, what is the army itself, but a body, whose conduct is a proper subject of criticism with the public? The army may be most competent to judge of the character of *commissaries* or *barrack-masters*; but of those who command in battles, the public can judge as well, or better, than the army.—— I must not conclude this article without noticing one very material circumstance. I now perceive, at a moment when I have not time to go through a comparison of the whole, that I have been copying from and commenting upon, a *second edition* of this pamphlet, and that, in the passage, relating to the "DOMESTIC CABINET," this second edition differs very materially from the first edition. In the *first* edition, the latter part of the passage runs thus: "Now, "the immediate and almost necessary "members of this party, are certainly the "king's family and household. From whom "else, indeed, should a family council—a "domestic cabinet—be composed, but of "the members of the family of those who "must necessarily have a community of "interest, and sympathy in feeling? *The* "*heir apparent alone, for very obvious rea-* "*sons, is seldom a member of this closet* "*council; all the other princes are almost* "*necessarily in the immediate confidence of* "*their sovereign and father.* Let it not, "therefore, be objected to the Duke of York, "that he has followed the course of things, "*and, with the QUEEN, is at the head of* "*the "KING'S FRIENDS."*——All the words here distinguished by Italic characters are left out in the second edition. This was found to be a little too much. It was found (by the *writer*, I mean, of course), that, to make our gracious Queen a politician, and one too of a junto, or cabal, to work even against the ministry selected by the king, would not do. This part, therefore, was, in the second edition, expunged.—— The Morning Chronicle asserts, that this pamphlet "has evidently been written un-"der the eye, and published with the sanc-"tion of the Duke of York! Nay," adds the Chronicle, "we conceive, that it must "have had the concurrence of the *highest* "authority in the kingdom."——And, while it is saying this, observe, this paper protests solemnly against ever having libelled the Duke of York.——I, on the contrary, look upon this pamphlet as coming from the very *lowest* and *dirtiest* source in the kingdom. Aye, the very dirtiest of all possible sources. What! attribute to the Duke of York and the King (Lord preserve us!) a pamphlet, which describes the whole of the royal family, together with others unknown, as being embodied in a sort of permanent conspiracy against the very ministers, whom the king selects to manage the affairs of the nation, through whom he acts, and the *responsibility* of whom is, we are told, the great security for our property and our lives! Attribute this pamphlet to the dictation of the Duke of York and the approbation of the king, and yet to resent the accusation of being a libeller! Verily the Morning Chronicle surpasses in assurance even the writer of this pamphlet, of which I shall now take my

leave, feeling no small degree of satisfaction at having had this opportunity of proving, by deed as well as word, the falsehood of the charge, preferred against me by this writer, of entertaining dislike towards the royal Commander in Chief.

Botley, 1st Sept. 1808.

SPAIN.—DUKE OF YORK.

Sir;—The enormous magnitude of the preparations which are now making by ministers for the assistance of the cause of patriotism in Spain, and the monstrous sums which the country must inevitably be called upon to sacrifice in order to render that assistance effectual, are contemplated by the people of these kingdoms with a painful mixture of exultation and alarm. They are viewed with the feelings of the most triumphant satisfaction by all the sound-hearted part of the community, because they regard them as dèmonstrative of the mature state of revolutionary feeling in that country; under the confidence that those to whom our resources are entrusted would not waste them on a cause which they had not good reason to believe was properly understood, and unanimously adopted by the whole Spanish population.—By the *revolutionary* feeling, I mean to describe that state of public sentiment, which is awakened to a concvition of the necessity of great and salutary changes in the fabric of the constitution, and to an abhorrence both of the searching and iron despotism of Napoleon, and of the filthy, corrupt, and stagnating influence of the superannuated dynasty of the Bourbons: a feeling, in short, which prompts an enslaved people to exclaim with one voice, in the language of Alcibiades to the profligate senate of his country:

" Till *now* you have gone on, and filled the time
" With all licentious measure; making your wills
" The scope of justice: till now myself, and such
" As slept within the shadow of your power,
" Have wandered with our travers'd arms, and
" breath'd
" Our suff'rance vainly: now the time is flush,
" When crouching marrow, in the bearer strong,
" Cries, of itself, 'No more!' Now breathless
" Wrong
" Shall sit and pant in your great chairs of ease;
" And pursy Insolence shall break his wind
" With fear and horrid flight."

SHAKESPEARE.

Such are the images which now, it is to be hoped, animate the dreams of every patriot in Spain; and such the accents to which his fancy moulds the sound of the trumpet which calls him forth to the conflict! And he that would dissipate such high thoughts—he that would whisper base and ignominious conditions as the price of our co-operation—who would refuse to assist them in dashing to the earth the chains which the murky Cyclops of France are now forging for them, until they shall passively have thrust forth their wrists to the gripe of that iron which has hitherto entered so deeply into their soul,—" a cleaving curse be that " man's inheritance to all generations!"—But, in the midst of all this exultation, is heard the whisper of apprehension and alarm. The last stake for the deliverance of Europe is now about to be played: Britain is about to shed the blood of some of the bravest of her sons in the contest; and is pouring out with zealous prodigality the fruits of her industry into the military chests of the patriots: and yet, in the moment of making all these sacrifices, the public, it seems, is not by any means fully and finally apprised of the individuals who are to be entrusted with the awful responsibility of command. In this interval of irritable and sensitive anxiety, when probably the deliverance of Spain is a theme which warms the heart of the humblest labourer or mechanic over his ale, the ear of the nation is still abused and disturbed by certain rumours, intimating, that an illustrious and royal duke " has not sur" rendered to the *prejudices of the people,*" but had pertinaciously insisted on the command in one of the expeditions that is expected to leave our coasts.—The prejudices of the people!! Why, surely, Sir, that illustrious personage must have been most scandalously libelled by those who have attributed to him either language or sentiments so insulting to the best feelings of this loyal and generous nation. Our *prejudices* all lie in *precisely an opposite direction.* The claim of royalty to all great and amiable qualities is with us immediately allowed—* *
* * * * * * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * * * * *
* * * *—While, however, I humbly venture to state my objections to the appointment of the illustrious duke to any foreign command, my *prejudices* do not blind me to the merits to which he is justly entitled. The late enlightened General Order, which has issued by his command, for cashiering the *Queues* of all the privates and non-commissioned officers of his majesty's forces, and the addition of a Sponge to their appointments, for the purpose of keeping their heads clean, claims a very large portion of the public gratitude! Whatever share in the deliverance of Spain (should it take

place) is to be attributed to this masterly and laudable measure, must unquestionably be due to the sagacity and judgment of the illustrious personage. Still, however, I should beg leave to suggest a doubt as to the prudence of recommending our patriotic allies to imitate our example of enlightened and convenient reform, by dismissing their *moustachios*; since it might possibly be productive of some aukward consequences, by interfering with their *national prejudices*. ——I am, Sir, &c.——A. B.—— *London, Aug.* 6, 1808.

To Sir Richard Phillips, Knight.

Dear Sir Richard;—After carefully collating the different reports, in the newspapers, of the trial, Carr versus Hood, and from my own recollection, I do not hesitate to say, that your assertion respecting the garbling of that report is not true.—The absurd nonsense you advance, about Reviews, hardly deserves notice. That your Oxford Review, your Public Characters, your Travels in Spain, and all your other publications, are manufactured in the way you represent, no one who knows Sir Richard Phillips, or is acquainted with his tricks, can doubt.—All the world knows that the Star, the Statesman, and other newspapers, inserted a "*Life of Sir Richard Phillips,*" WRITTEN BY HIMSELF, and were PAID for so doing.—But, for such a man as you, to take credit to yourself for "*exposing a cratt,*" of whom *you* and the Crosbys and the Cundees and the Murrays and the Hoggs, and the other *manufacturers* of publications are in hourly dread, is the *ne plus ultra* of assurance.—As I do not mean to take up much time in convicting you, good Sir Richard, pray answer me the following questions, and I will inform you and Mr. Cobbett's readers, whether or not "You waste your time in reading Reviews."—Did you not threaten to withdraw your employment from Gillet, the printer, because he printed the number of the Critical Review, in which Pratt's Harvest Home is cut up? Did you not send your man, Hucklebridge, to the publishers of the Edinburgh Review, to solicit the perusal of a late number, as you understood they had received some by coach? Does not Gillet get some other printer to print those sheets of the Satirist, which interfere with your interests? Did you not dispatch your brother-in law, Surr, when you returned from a city feast, on June the 30th, at 11 o'clock at night, to warn the wholesale booksellers, not to sell that month's Satirist? Did you not, at a considerable expense to yourself, get your attorney to send Circular Letters to the poor, innocent, booksellers of Margate, Ramsgate, Brighton, and fifty other places, threatening them with the utmost severity of the law, if they dared to vend the said publication? Upon your oath, could you say that you neither purchase nor borrow the Reviews monthly, from Symonds, or any other bookseller? For what reason did George Woodfall send you, in a way that I will not describe, out of his printing office?—In waiting for answers to these questions, I have the honour to be, dear Sir Richard, your obedient humble servant—Echo.—*London, August* 11, 1808.

Mr. Bewley's Letter to Sir Richard Phillips.

Mr. Cobbett;—As a sincere admirer of every thing, which, in these times of foppery and ostentation, wears the semblance of modest demeanor, I beg to be permitted, through the channel of your widely circulated Register, to pay a tribute of undissembled homage to your new correspondent Sir Richard Phillips, and to sympathize with the votaries of genius and learning in regretting the harsh and unhandsome treatment with which he has been assailed from the rude dialectic weapons of the law. With regard to the late Trial which has excited such universal attention, the World of Letters has been held in admiration both of the disinterestedness and the prudence of Sir John Carr, who gave it birth, and of Sir Richard's dexterity, who embraced, upon this occasion, the opportunity of enlightening us with his opinions of Literature and Criticism. These opinions are now gone forth, and will stand for ever, like axioms in the Mathematics, clear and indisputable. They will at once regulate and fix the taste of the timid scholar who distrusts his own judgment, and happy will that controversialist be who can render his polemical warfare successful, and give a death-blow to the arguments of his antagonist, by citing the oracular and unerring judgment of the learned Knight in support of his own decisions. Strange, indeed, it is, Sir, that the public, in an age like this, which has ironically been termed civilized and accomplished, should have been so blind and bigotted as never to have descried the varied erudition, the exquisite taste, and acute wit of that immaculate production, the Oxford Review; until, alas! the monarch of literature, Sir Richard, whom God long preserve! conferred disgrace and derision on us all, by pointing to its untimely death-bed. Let the guardian, however, of this interest-

ing *élève* take courage and be comforted. Milton lived in ungrateful times, and many years rolled away before the merits of Paradise Lost were known or acknowledged; and, even in our own days, Chatterton too impatiently bore the churlish fang of necessity, and crushed the germs of his mighty genius before they had blossomed into maturity. Even so, Sir Richard The Oxford Review, which emanated from *his* genius, has been strangled in its infancy—the oracle of wisdom and of science is dumb, and well has the learned Knight revenged himself upon the World of Letters for its cold neglect, by relinquishing it to utter and hopeless ignorance.—But, Sir, I have been hurried away into this eulogium upon my illustrious friend, by the warmth of my feelings, and had almost forgotten the original purport of my letter. In the Trial alluded to above, Sir Richard was asked, "Whether he ever "read or suffered his opinions to be in- "fluenced by the criticisms of the Edin- "burgh Review?" Sir Richard answered, upon his oath, "That he never read anony- "mous scurrility;—that, upon the first "appearance of the Edinburgh Review, he "had looked into it, but that he had not "read it for these six years," &c. Now, Sir, it is with ineffable sorrow I relate, that no longer ago than the year 1805, a book entitled "A Voyage round the World, &c." was written by John Turnbull, and published by Sir Richard Phillips. This book is criticized in the Edinburgh Review for January 1807; and I have seen again and again a part of this criticism, which is extremely favourable, affixed, by way of recommendation, to the advertisements of the book in the public papers, and which advertisements are all evidently superintended by, and subscribed with the name of, Richard Phillips! The Attorney General, who, upon the trial, seemed neither to be awed into admiration by the impressive grandeur of Sir Richard's Court Dress, nor to consider him any more a *man of letters* than his *postman*, told the Jury with very bad manners, that "Sir "Richard had either slipped in his evidence, "or was the greatest fool that ever trod the "earth." No candid man can accredite either of these insinuations; but that slander may be silenced and abashed, I hope Sir Richard will condescend to give an explanation of the mysterious circumstance to which I have alluded.—In the mean time, I have the honour to subscribe myself, with homage bordering on idolatry, his most obsequious and devoted admirer,—GEORGE BEWLEY.—*Oxford, August* 16, 1808.

TO SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, BART.

SIR,—I beg leave to offer to your consideration some remarks on the language imputed to you by the newspaper reporters of the debate which took place in the House of Commons on the 8th of June, on the bill entitled "The Stipendiary Curates' Bill."—Your speech, Sir, is variously given; but in no report that I have seen can I discover that regard for first principles, and that reprobation of abuse, which characterise your observations on other topics; and highly as I respect the man, who in this age of venality and supineness, stands forward the firm, upright, and unvarying assertor of the genuine principles of the English constitution, I cannot but regret that he should overlook the principles on which our ecclesiastical establishment is founded.—For what purpose, let me ask, was the church of England instituted? Was it that it might become an engine of state—that it might extend the influence of the crown by placing at its disposal the most valuable benefices? Was it that an asylum might be afforded to the helpless or unworthy relatives and friends of the peers and wealthy commoners of the realm? If so, I could at once understand, had it been put into the mouth of any one else, what you are reported to have said, about "overturning the whole system of clerical *property*,"—and "similar encroachments on the *property* of lay impropriators." Coming from YOU, Sir Francis, this language would still be unintelligible. But if, as it has always been declared, the church was founded that the Christian religion might be preached to all ranks of the community, in its genuine, its unpolluted purity, where is the wrong, in making such alterations in the "system of clerical property" as will render that property more subservient to the object in view? Property, I conceive, was connected with the church, that it might be so subservient; and the legitimate use of it, is to provide the needful maintenance of a body of men, whose business it is to apply themselves *exclusively* to the ministerial office: and we find by different statutes, that in furtherance of this intention, the clergy are invested with certain privileges, and subjected to certain disabilities, "*in regard of their own continual attendance on their sacred functions*"—or as it is elsewhere expressed, that they may "*attend the more closely to the service of Almighty God.*"—We know, however, that in numerous cases the revenues of the church are very differently applied. It is unnecessary to inquire from

what sources the ecclesiastical property has sprung —If it be correct that it professedly originated in the principle I have stated, (and this I believe will not be disputed) I contend that it is the duty of those who have the power to see that it is made use of in conformity with that principle. You, Sir, inveigh against a practice in the state of giving large salaries to men for performing the duties of certain offices, which are in fact filled by clerks, at much reduced though still sufficient salaries; this you justly term a prostitution of the public money. But where, let me ask, is the difference in the principle of appointing rectors who never visit their parishioners? In the effect, indeed, I see a difference by no means to the advantage either of the church or of the object of its institution; for how many of the half-paid curates are constrained, by an anxiety to feed their families, to neglect "the sacred function" which has been abandoned to them by their overpaid superiors—the intention of the privileges and disabilities, to which, as already stated, the body of the clergy are by law made liable, being thus entirely defeated.—It appears to me to be a matter of no importance by whom is held the power of dispensing the livings of the church, so that laws exist to direct the manner in which it shall be exercised, and that it is exercised accordingly. Whether these livings are the property (we ought, I think, to say *in the trust)* of the church, or of lay impropriators, be it remembered that their revenues are wholly or in part derived from the public; and that certain duties are annexed to them, by the performance of which the public expect and have a right to expect to be benefited. But if those who possess this power (who, I repeat, should only be considered in the light of trustees) apply any part of these revenues to the use either of themselves, or of men who though ordained of the church, regard neither their offices nor ought belonging to them save only their emoluments, how can the cause of religion be served, and where is the *benefit* which the public seek from the establishments? It is fit, therefore, that authority should somewhere exist to inquire by whom the revenues are received, and how the duties are performed; and I partly approve of "the Stipendiary Curates' Bill," because to a certain point it would have given effect to this authority; but I also had objections to it. These, however, did not arise from its interference with the property of the church. For the reasons already given, this, in the shape of strong parliamentary regulations, is, I think, much to be wished for. My opinion is, that it was not sufficiently comprehensive—it did not go far enough—it should have been framed to compel the clergy to do their duty *each for him elf*—to oblige the mitred lords to reside in their several dioceses—to be careful whom they admit into holy orders, but to see that when admitted the whole brotherhood, beneficed or not, faithfully discharged their solemn obligations. This, however, would, under present circumstances, be too much to expect; and I own I was glad to see even an attempt to distribute the salaries of the clergy on a standard more in conformity with the rules of arithmetic.—If the higher order of the clergy are still to live by the labour of their curates, surely these (I say it with all due deference to the Christian benevolence of ecclesiastical proprietaries) ought to derive from the same source a comfortable subsistence for their families and themselves. I know not, Sir, whether you would call this overturning "the whole system of clerical "property;" but would it not lead to a purification of that system, which would render it more worthy of the religion it is intended to support?—You object to the additional power which would have been given by the bill in question to the bench of bishops, and to the attendant extension of the undue influence at elections to which clerical freeholders are already subject. Sir, I admit the full weight of these objections, and I do not mean to lessen it when I remark that they apply with nearly equal force to the power and influence now existing. If you could entirely destroy that power and influence, I might pause before I proceed to the argument I am about to advance; but I consider it only as a comparatively inconsiderable increase of an existing evil which would probably in a great measure remove an evil of vast and growing magnitude. Unquestionably this might be more effectually accomplished, (and without incurring your objections), by placing the power in the hands of the laity, which the bill would have given to the bishops. But this I only presume *en passant* to mention. Were I to propose it, I might revive the cry that "the church is in danger;" and I should be sorry to disturb Mr. Perceval in the formation of his vigorous schemes or in his consultations with his mitred friends. —I may be allowed, however, to express my regret that the stipendiary curates' bill should have afforded another proof of the influence of "the junto behind the throne."—That this subject should undergo a more ample discussion is not merely desirable, it is in my mind essential to the welfare of the establishment. The church, Sir, is more in danger from the mode pursued of appointing her ministers and of applying her revenues,

than from the united zeal for proselytism of all the sects; and those who pretend to be so staunchly her friends would better evince the sincerity of their professions by endeavouring to bring about a reform, than by joining in the factious and vulgar bawl of "no popery." When the offices of the church are thus considered as so much property which, without regard to the duties annexed to them, may be bought and sold, how can we be surprised that offices in the state, and seats in the House of Commons should also be taken into the estimate of individual wealth? They are all abuses belonging to the same system, they have a common origin, and are employed for a common purpose. Do you imagine, that when a rectory is sold, the welfare of the parish is consulted? Far from it: you might as well suppose that attention is paid to the interest of the public, when places and boroughs are transferred from one possessor to another. No, Sir; it is well if the parish do not suffer by the change. There are, I am aware, some cases which form honourable exceptions to his character; but so few are they, as to be scarcely worthy of mention, unless it be as examples of private excellence exerted for the public good.—We are taught to regard our ecclesiastical and civil establishments as monuments of the wisdom and virtue of our forefathers—with more propriety may we look upon them as *the remains*. But when we hear that the friends of this young nobleman, or that young commoner, who has wasted his substance in riot and extravagance, are about to provide for him by procuring him a living, a place, or a borough, how can we avoid being reminded of two stupendous almshouses, where high-born mendicants are charitably received! I request your attention, Sir, to the foregoing letter, and am, with every sentiment of respect—A FRIEND TO RADICAL REFORM.—*Liverpool, Aug.* 20, 1808.

POOR.—MITCHAM.

SIR;—As the reduction of the poor's rate is become an object of such national concern, not merely on pecuniary considerations, but because it tends to debase and enervate the minds of the lower orders of the people, who were once considered, and ought now to be the strength of the country, I was pleased to see you relate in your valuable work, an account of some gentlemen who had been successful in lessening the burthen, and reforming the abuses of their respective parishes. You gave this relation in honourable testimony of their zeal, to shew the thing is practicable if ably executed, and to excite resident country gentlemen to the same laudable exertion. Allow me, Sir, to introduce another case to the notice of your readers as a further stimulus.—The parish of Mitcham in the county of Surrey, had for many years been suffering the dictatorship of Methodists and members of the Suppression of Vice Society; under whose government the poor were fed on cheap provisions, rice and dried herrings; a walk was raised two-fifths of a mile over the common, for the saints to visit and pray with the idle and profligate at the workhouse; eternal complaints were made by the paupers to the bench of magistrates, the rates were from 12 to 14 shillings in the pound, and the parish were nearly £700 in debt.—About 5 or 6 years ago a Mr. Moore, the lord of the manor, having some hundred acres of freehold, and occupying some hundreds more, felt the increase of poor rates oppressively himself, and listening to the complaints of the neighbourhood, although he had an exemption from parish offices, yet offered himself to be one of the overseers; having held the office for 3 years he paid off the old standing debt, reduced the rate from 5s. to 5s. 6d, and left £100 in hand though the rate was burthened with the half bounties for militia men, and the maintenance of their wives and families, which had not been the case in his predecessors' time; though he apprenticed out with parish fees between 30 and 40 of the children who before had been "fed with the "bread of idleness," and though he at a very considerable expence repaired the workhouse.—His first step was to compel 2-5ths of the able but idle paupers to maintain themselves, who had been supported without work at public expense, merely because they affected saintship; the rest, who were not incapacitated by age or infirmity, were employed in labour according to their abilites. No householder was excused paying rates for religious or political party's sake; every man renting above £5 per annum was compelled to pay his share of the burthen; the lower orders thereby feeling the obligation they were under to the larger renters for their larger share of the compulsive subscription, which they were least likely ever to be benefited by themselves: thus the poorer part became concerned in keeping the rate low; while the actual paupers were rendered more comfortable, are better fed and clothed, are kept in habits of industry and led to *sober* habits of religion. *(To be continued.)*

Printed by Cox and Baylis, Great Queen Street; published by R. Bagshaw, Brydges Street, Covent-Garden, where former Numbers may be had: sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall.